UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social
Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/1990/86
5 March 1990

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Forty-sixth session
Agenda item 10

QUESTION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF ALL PERSONS SUBJECTED TO
ANY FORM OF DETENTION OR IMPRISONMENT

Letter dated 22 February 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights

I have the honour to enclose herewith a message addressed to you on behalf of the Turkish Cypriot Community, one of the two main parties to the Cyprus dispute, by H.E. Mr. Kenan ATAKOL, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Defence.

As will be recalled, a statement was made in the Commission on Human Rights, on the issue of missing persons in Cyprus, unfortunately in the absence of the Turkish Cypriot Community. Under these circumstances the Turkish Cypriot Community has been left with no alternative but to submit its views in writing, so that its views could at least appear on the records.

It will be appreciated if the present letter and the attachment thereto would be issued, in line with practice as before, as a document of the Commission on Human Rights under agenda item 10.

(Signed) Cem Duna
Ambassador

GE.90-11496/5554A

best copy available

ANNEX

TURKISH REPUBLIC OF NORTHERN CYPRUS
MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE
(Lefkosa, via Mersin-10 TURKEY)

21 February, 1990

Your Excellency,

Unfortunately, the Greek Cypriot side persists, unabated, in its policy of exploiting the issue of missing persons in Cyprus for political purposes and it is precisely that policy which has prevented the Committee on Missing Persons, set up in 1981 to deal with the problem, from concluding its task.

2. The Committee was set up in 1981 after agreement between the two sides and comprises, besides a Turkish Cypriot and a Greek Cypriot representative, a Third Member, nominated by the International Committee of the Red Cross and appointed by the UN Secretary General. The current Third Member is an eminent former Swiss Ambassador who has been serving since May 1985.

3. It is, indeed, a sad irony that the Greek Cypriot side, on the one hand, raises the issue at every international platform it has access to, as the illegitimate "Government of Cyprus" and where the Turkish Cypriot people is not represented, making the unfounded allegations and accusations of non-cooperation on the part of the "Turkish" side, and on the other hand, the same Greek Cypriot side is deliberately blocking progress in the work of the Committee, in order to seemingly support those baseless allegations and accusations.

4. The constant reference by the Greek Cypriot side in this context, to the "Turkish" as opposed to the "Turkish Cypriot" side is due to their policy to exploit this sensitive humanitarian issue against Turkey and to detract attention from the inter-communal nature of the conflict in Cyprus and from the fact that disappearances took place from both communities in 1963-64 and 1974. Further proof of their political approach to this humanitarian problem is their decision not to submit to the Committee for investigation the cases of some fifty Greek Cypriots who disappeared during the events of 1963-1964 in order not to "contradict" the myth put out by them that the Cyprus problem started in 1974 with the so-called "Turkish invasion and occupation".

Her Excellency Prof. Dr. Purificacion V. Quisumbing,
President of the 46th Session
UN Human Rights Commission
Geneva.

5. The Committee on Missing Persons in Cyprus which is charged with the task of investigating the fate of missing persons belonging to both communities has in fact done considerable work in collecting information concerning the 169 cases (60 Turkish Cypriot and 109 Greek Cypriot. it has been investigating since 1984. And, whilst the Committee should have concluded by now these 169 cases and proceeded to investigating so many other cases, on both sides, which await investigation, unfortunately, it has not been able to do so because the Greek Cypriot side's representative on the Committee, which has to act by concencus, has blocked progress by demanding the discovery of identifiable remains of every one of the 109 Greek Cypriot cases before concluding any of them and before submitting any new cases for investigation. A demand, which is neither required by the Committee's agreed Terms of Reference nor is it physically possible or practicable in the circumstances of Cyprus. The impossibility of such a demand would, I am sure, be vouched also by the many esteemed delegates of the International Committee of the Red Cross who rendered invaluable services in Cyprus at the relevant times.

6. Moreover, the Greek Cypriot Member of the Committee, upon political instructions, has blocked information being given to the families of the 169 missing persons whose cases have been investigated in-depth since 1984 and about which considerable information has been collected.

7. Further proof of Greek Cypriot politization of the issue is their refusal to agree, through the Greek Cypriot representative on the Committee of M.ssing Persons, to the issue by the Committee of an informative and meaningful communique on its activities so far and on the practical difficulties it is facing. The very short, cryptic, uninformative communiques which have been repeatedly issued by the Committee so far is due to the "veto" of the Greek Cypriot side's representative on the Committee.

8. I submit as Appendix I, the text of a draft informative press communique the release of which by the Committee has been delayed since the Summer of .989 due to the refusal of the Greek Cypriot representative to give his consent on the pretext that it would create difficulties for him and allegedly cause a reaction from the Committee of Relatives of Greek Cypriot Missing Persons. And yet the same persons tell the opposite to people outside the Committee, particularly to the media.

9. I quote, herebelow, an extract of a particular allegation contained in an article written by journalist Rachael Gillet, published in the Cyprus Mail newspaper of 21 July 1989, which offers clearcut evidence of the insincere attitude of the Greek Cypriot side concerning the issue of missing persons. Miss Gillett's article was based on interviews she had with Father Christoforos, Chairman of the Committee of Relatives of Greek Cypriot Missing Persons and with Mr. Ellas Georgiades the Greek Cypriot Representative on the Tripartite Committee of Missing Persons.

"In May 1984 the Committee began working on its first batch of 109 cases of Greek Cypriot missing persons and 60 Turkish Cypriot missing persons. Five years later little more than periodic press releases saying that the investigations are still in process have been released to the public. The lack of progress has angered the relatives who blame the narrow framework with which the Committee has to work".

9. It is noteworthy that during the interview with journalist Gillett, the tripartite committee was criticized, in effect, for not issuing more informative press releases and for not giving the families concerned any information; the very proposal which the Greek Cypriot Member on the Committee has been rejecting! As the article contains more such unfounded allegations, I attach herewith as Appendix II, a list of all those allegations together with the Turkish Cypriot side's brief comments thereon, a careful and objective evaluation of which will readily confirm the politically motivated approach of the Greek Cypriot side to the missing persons issue.

10. In conclusion, I would like to appeal for Your Excellency's good offices to try to persuade the Greek Cypriot side to desist from their political exploitation of this tragic humanitarian issue the continuation of which serves no purpose other than protracting the agony of the hundreds of Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot families concerned and to secure the Greek Cypriot side's cooperation with the Committee in order that it may discharge its mandate in accordance with humanitarian principles and in the sole interest of the families concerned.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

K. Atakol

(Dr. Kenan Atakol)
Minister of Foreign Affairs and Defence

READEX FICHE

APPENDIX I

DRAFT REVISED VERSION

26 January 1990

PRESS COMMUNIQUE

1. In its last communique (October 25, 1989), the CMP alluded to some of the difficulties it was facing. Recent developments have shown that there is little public knowledge of the realities of the activities of the Committee and of the nature of its difficulties. Though bound by rules of discretion and confidentiality, the CMP may not have been sufficiently explicit in its public announcements.

2. As the Committee has already said in the past, its activity is based on two fundamental elements:

a) The files and documents submitted to it by each side on the missing persons of that side.
b) The testimony of the witnesses, both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot, interviewed by the investigative teams.

3. The Committee underlines here that it is a purely humanitarian organ; it has no police or judicial powers. Indeed, such powers would be in total contradiction to its basic humanitarian nature, as it is concerned with obtaining information, and not with attributing responsibility for the disappearances.

4. The investigative teams are organised by, and are under the entire responsibility of, the Greek Cypriot or Turkish Cypriot sides, as the case may be. The Third Member and/or his assistant(s) participate in the interviews, put questions, as well as make any visits in the field which the investigations may require.

5. The real, central difficulty the Committee is confronted with, is that the witnesses are often reluctant or unable to give full information on the disappearance of a missing person. The co-operation of the witnesses is absolutely essential for the Committee. When witnesses are reluctant to give complete and precise evidence, the Committee is faced with a serious problem, because it may not then have at its disposal all the information it needs. Although the Members can have different views as to the quality of the information necessary to draw conclusions, there is agreement in the Committee the the fullest and most exact information possible must be sought.

6. The reasons for the reluctance of the witnesses, regrettable as this reluctance is, can be explained, in certain circumstances, where the witness is afraid of incriminating himself or incriminating others in disappearances which may have ended in violent death.

7. The Committee and its investigative teams repeatedly tell all witnesses that information given to the Committee and to the teams will be kept strictly confidential and that they, the witnesses, will not be subject to any form of police or judicial prosecution. This policy was decided in order to reassure the witnesses as far as possible.

8. In this connection, theCommittee solemnly appeals to both sides to pursue, with renewed vigour, their assistance to the Committee, so that it can accomplish its humanitarian mandate in the best conditions. A significant contribution in this respect is to encourage generally all witnesses interviewed by the Committee, in the framework of its procedures, to give the very fullest information in their knowledge.

9. In order to further allay the fears of the witnesses, the Committee, so as to give the strongest guarantees to the witnesses, is examining measures that could be taken to ensure that they would be immune from judicial and/or police proceedings solely in connection with the issue of missing persons and for any statement, written or oral, made for the Committee, in the pursuit of activities within its mandate: ("Amnesty" problem)

10. Another element complicates the work of the Committee; the mere passage of time (disappearance of missing persons 15 or even 25 years ago). Some witnesses are now too old to remember precisely the events surrounding the disappearances; others have left the country in the meantime, or are dead.

It must also be recalled that the disappearances in 1963-1964 and in 1974 occurred during states of belligerency, civil war and general confusion.

11. The Committee feels obliged to repeat here that, in order to fulfill its mandate, and to take decisions, the Committee must act by consensus, that is by unanimous agreement amongst the three Members.

12. The Committee is fully aware of the anguish and anxiety of the families. It would obviously be most desirous of finding ways and means to relieve their uncertainties: (Information to the families)

13. It is also clear, however, that to reach conclusions on the evidence submitted, the Committee must have a common appreciation of the value of this evidence. The Committee has not been able as yet to reach that stage; it is pursuing its efforts to find an indispensable common denominator.

14. The desire of the families to obtain a definite proof of death through an identification procedure of the body of the missing one is, of course, a universal and legitimate one, notably also for religious reasons. The investigative teams have systematically enquired on both sides on bodies of missing persons, Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot. However, on neither side, has the Committee been successful in finding a body, thereby obviously precluding any possibility of identification.

15. The Committee has also now requested that the two sides furnish it with the totality of the files concerning all missing persons. The Committee will thus have a global view of the whole problem and also hope thereby to get indications that help it to conclude on the first 169 cases, as in many instances many cases of missing persons, on both sides, are, or could be, related.

16. In concludion, it is under these serious and objective difficulties that the Committee has to accomplish its task. The Committee will do everything to pursue vigourously all the necessary investigations to obtain the fullest possible information on all the disappearances of the missing persons, both Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot, and communicate the results of its investigations to both sides as early as possible.

APPENDIX II

ALLEGATIONS MADE IN RACHAEL GILLETTE' S REPORT ON MISSING PERSONS IN CYPRUS PUBLISHED IN CYPRUS MAIL OF 21.7.1989 AND THE TURKISH CYPRIOT SIDE' S COMMENTS THEREON

Allegation (1): Turkey did not release 1619 of the Greek Cypriot prisoners who had been transported to Turkey after the 1974 events.

Comment (1): The ICRC statement of 11.3.1976 negates this.

Allegation (2): The Greek Cypriot side wants to know if the missing Greek Cypriots are dead, nor who killed them or under what conditions.

Comment (2): The approach of the GKC side, so far, is not that. The recent Kufi Azmi incident also tends to support the contrary view.

Allegation (3): The Turkish Cypriot side did not allow the Committee to begin its work until the Greek Cypriot side made the concession that the Turkish Cypriot missing persons of 1963-64 would also be investigated.

Comment (3): This is not a true or fair statement. Surely, the human rights of the Turkish Cypriot families of missing persons are no less sacred than those of the Greek Cypriots.

./.

Allegation (4): The CMP has for the last five years, only made periodic press releases saying merely that the investigations are still in progress.

Comment (4): I agree, I have always suggested that the CMP should issue more informative press releases.

Allegation (5): The narrow framework which does not allow investigations to be conducted in Turkey also is the cause of non-progress.

Comment (5): The comment is irrelevant. The CMP has to act within the agreed Terms of Reference. All these considerations were taken into account when the two sides formulated the Terms of Reference with the assistance of the SGSR in Cyprus between 1978-1981. Besides, no evidence has ever been submitted to the CMP in support of allegations that there are Greek Cypriot missing persons in Turkey.

Allegation (6): The majority of the 1619 Greek Cypriot missing persons were last seen in Turkey.

Comment (6): Untrue statement.

Allegation (7): News trickling out from Turkey indicate that some of the missing Greek Cypriots may yet be alive.

Comment (7): Evidence has not been submitted to the CMP, despite repeated requests, in support of the allegation.

./..

Allegation (8): The fact that the Committee has been charged with the investigations of Turkish Cypriot cases for the period 1963-64 has made more difficult and time-consuming the investigating process.

Comment (8): Not true or fair. In fact the "chief actors" of the period of 1963-64 who were responsible for or at least must have information about Turkish Cypriot missing persons are known and their names have been given to the CMP with a request that they be questioned by the Greek Cypriot Member's investigating team. The position is that those named have either not been interviewed or they seem to have denied everything.

Allegation (9): The Turkish Cypriots claim their own missing. In 1974 the ICRC said that there were 106 missing Turkish Cypriots. The Greek Cypriots accounted for 97 of them. 96 were on British base in Akrotiri and were later transferred to Turkey and from there to Northern Cyprus. The 97th was dead. For the other 9 we were never given details and so we could not investigate the cases. After this, the Turkish Cypriots never mentioned any missing until 1976.

Comment (9): This allegation is absurd and, with due respect, provocatively untrue. To allege to a journalist that in 1974 the Turkish Cypriots had only 9 missing persons when in fact, before the very interview with the said journalist, the Taskent (Tokhni) cases of 84 Turkish Cypriots as well as three others, a total of 87, had been submitted to the CMP for investigation, is a shameful lie, to say the least.

Allegation (10): The Greek Cypriot concensus is that by throwing in the Turkish Cypriot missing, Mr. Denktas devised a stalling tactic for the Greek Cypriots to find out what has happened to their own missing.

Comment (10): Not true. A very unfair, politically-motivated statement.

Allegation (11): The Turkish Cypriot representative, Mr. Rustem Tatar, even went as far as to say in 1985: "We have accepted that they are dead, the only thing we want to know is where their graves are."

Comment (11): Not true.

Allegation (12): For the Greek Cypriot side the reverse is true. They will not accept the missing are dead until they see their graves.

Comment (12): True. Main stumbling block to progress.

Allegation (13): Another problem is that the Greek Cypriot representative is not allowed to go to the North for the purpose of investigation but has to rely on information collected by the UN and Turkish Cypriot representative.

Comment (13):Irrelevant. Costs doubt on integrity of the other members of the CMP.

Allegation (14): The more time that passes the harder it will become to find out the truth. In many cases witnesses have died others are difficult to locate, which others are afraid or refuse to testify.

Comment (14): Very true.

Allegation (15): There is little doubt that evidence has been collected by the Committee, but whatever evidence it has collected has not been released to the public or the relatives.

Comment (15): Very true. Let us do that.

./....

Allegation (16): Access to Turkey is essential. Once the Terms of Reference are extended progress will be possible.

Comment (16): Irrelevant. Same comment as for allegation (5).

Allegation (17): The Greek Cypriot Member must be allowed over to the North, the Turkish Cypriots must be prepared to show graves so that forensic experts can study the remains.

Comment (17): Irrelevant. Not envisaged in the agreed Terms of Reference. That is a politically-motivated objective.

Allegation (18): Andreas Kassapis, an American citizen, was on Turkey's list of prisoners due to be released; he was also heard alive in prison after the end of the hostilities.

Comment (18): Not true. There has never been a "Turkey's list of prisoners due to be released". The so-called "students lists" on which Kassapis' name appeared were lists prepared on information supplied by the families through the UN indicating names of Greek Cypriot combatants or prisoners who, it was requested should be released, in priority, so that they might go to their places of higher education outside of Cyprus. The lists were not Turkey's or even Turkish Cypriot side's list of "students" who were alive and who were to be released. All this is confirmed in a letter on the subject signed by Dr. Reme Gorge, the then Swiss Senior Political Adviser to the SGSR in Cyprus.

Allegation (19): There is little hope of getting "conclusive" evidence so desperately needed for one case of missing persons to be closed.

Comment (19): True if "conclusive evidence" means identifiable remains.

./.....

Allegation (20):Evidence has been collected in 1974 proving that some of the missing were alive after the end of hostilities. In recent years evidence centres on people who have visited Turkey or been imprisoned there coming back with stories that they have seen or heard about imprisoned Greek Cypriots.

Comment (20): If indeed such evidence exists, it should be submitted to the CMP.

Allegation (21): The following evidence has been collected indicating that there are Greek Cypriots alive in Turkish jails.

a) Lists of prisoners of war released by the Turkish Cypriots and included in the lists of them to be released. Some like Andreas Kassapis never released.

b) Persons identified in photographs. (Ergin Konuksever's photos).

c) Persons who spoke over Bairak Radio.

d) Prisoners seen in Turkish jails by others later released.

e) Relatives recognized in BBC film taken in Sept. 1974.

f) Retired General Demirel's statement to Günaydin Kibris about Greek Cypriot soldiers and officers hiding in the mountains a year after the hostilities had ended.

g) Iranian businessman's statement that his nephew who was in a Turkish jail in 1975 had seen 31 Greek Cypriot captives there.

h) The disclosure of an English couple, who had gone on a motoring tour in Turkey, that they had seen Greek Cypriots in a village cutting stones.

Comment (21): None of these allegations or the "evidence" has been submitted to the CMP or proved to be correct. The National Guard soldiers seen in Ergin Konuksever's photos were unfortunately shot dead by unknown Turkish Cypriot fighters most probably to avenge the death of their own relatives in the hands of the Greek Cypriot National Guard which had the area in question and its Turkish Cypriot inhabitants under their armed occupation and control. Ergin Konuksever has testified to that effect in person on a special visit to Cyprus.

UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social
Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/1990/87
5 March 1990

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Forty-sixth session
Agenda item 12

QUESTION OF THE VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS IN ANY PART OF THE WORLD, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO COLONIAL AND OTHER DEPENDENT COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES

Letter dated 22 February 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations Office at Geneva addressed to the Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights

1. I have the honour to enclose herewith a message addressed to you on behalf of one of the two main parties to the Cyprus dispute, i.e. the Turkish Cypriot Community, by H.E. Mr. Kenan Atakol, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Defence.

2. As will be recalled, a debate was initiated in the Commission on Human Rights, on the question of Cyprus, unfortunately in the absence of the Turkish Cypriot Community, one of the two main parties to the conflict. Under these circumstances, the Turkish Cypriot Community has been left with no alternative but to submit its views in writing, so that its views could at least appear on the records.

3. It will be appreciated if the present letter and the attachment thereto would be issued, in line with practice as before, as a document of the Commission on Human Rights under agenda item 12.

(Signed) Cem Duna
Ambassador
Permanent representative

Annex

1. I would like to refer to the statement made by the representative of the Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus, under agenda item 13 A, during the forty-sixth session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, and to bring to your kind attention the following considerations.

2. I wish, at the outset, to express our surprise at the inclusion, in the agenda, of the "question of human rights in Cyprus", since, as we have always tried to impress upon the third parties, human rights violations in Cyprus took place between the years 1963 and 1974 and not after 1974. To the Greek Cypriot propagandists, international forums, especially those specializing on human rights, are venues where they, in the absence of any Turkish Cypriot representative, distort and exploit this issue for political purposes. Hence, the Greek Cypriot representative, in his endeavours to gloss over facts relating to Cyprus, deliberately omitted as usual, the pre-1974 period while grossly distorting the post-1974 period.

3. Human rights violations indeed constituted a most tragic aspect of the question of Cyprus between 1963 and 1974, when the Turkish Cypriot people were the victims of inhuman treatment and systematic oppression as well as repeated massacres. There are abundant documentation, testimonies and observations by impartial personalities and reports of the international press that expose the widespread and gross abuses to which the Turkish Cypriots were subjected through long years of Greek Cypriot tyranny and terror. I enclose in the appendix to the present letter clippings to help refresh unprejudiced memories. (See General Assembly document A/41/989.) Also, the annals of the United Nations, in particular the periodic reports presented by successive Secretaries-General to the Security Council on the situation in Cyprus, should prove to be highly edifying in this context.

4. The Greek Cypriot side, in its ruthless attempt to unite Cyprus with Greece, in accordance with the notorious Akritas Plan, had, in the period 1963-1974, violated practically every single human right of the Turkish Cypriot people. In pursuit of Enosis, they have brought terrorism to Cyprus as far back as the late 1950s and as of December 1963 launched an all-out armed onslaught against Turkish Cypriot people, killing, oppressing and persecuting defenceless people at will. During this period, Turkish Cypriots were hunted down in their own land, abducted from roads and even from hospital beds never to be seen again, children were slaughtered in bathtubs. Turkish Cypriot villages were raided and burnt down; in some villages whole populations were massacred and bulldozed into mass graves. Consequently, Turkish Cypriot people, in this period, were pushed into enclaves where they had to endure for 11 years, until the long-awaited Turkish intervention in 1974, a terrible ordeal under a "veritable siege", as the then United Nations Secretary-General had, in 1964, described the situation in one of his reports to the Security Council. This was then the plight of the Turkish people of Cyprus, which the Security Council tried to put an end to, when the United Nations Peace-keeping Force (UNFICYP) was established and sent to the island in 1964. The savage, premeditated Greek Cypriot assault on the Turkish Cypriots, which also resulted in the ejection of the Turkish Cypriot wing of the then bi-national Republic from all the organs of the State, and in the usurpation of the entire State machinery by an all-Greek Cypriot régime in Cyprus, continued, despite the existence of UNFICYP, until 1974 with varying degrees of severity.

5. It is ironic that the Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus should, against this background, have the insolence to assert that freedom of movement and settlement, and the right to property have precedence over Turkish Cypriot lives. The long history of hostake-taking, abductions, tortures, inhuman and degrading treatment, looting and burning of houses and whole villages, the economic destruction and oppression which the Turkish Cypriots suffered until 1974, in addition to the armed attacks and massacres cannot be erased from the annals of history.

6. The Greek-sponsored coup d'etat of 15 July 1974 in Cyprus to force annexation by Greece was the last ring in the chain of plots and faits accomplis against the independence of Cyprus and against Turkish Cypriot human, political, economic, social and cultural rights as one of the two co-founders of the bi-national Republic. The intervention of Turkey on 20 July 1974, in accordance with the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee, to protect the Turkish Cypriot people and prevent the imminent annexation of the island by Greece, brought to a definite end a decade of violence and bloodshed. The Greek Cypriot complaints, therefore, about the human rights situation in Cyprus can be nothing else than a hysterical expression of their racist longing for recreating the conditions of 1963-1974.

7. In view of their notorious record partly cited above, the Greek Cypriot side is hardly qualified to raise the question of "human rights in Cyprus".

8. Having thus set the record straight, I would now like to respond to a few specific, groundless accusations made by the Greek Cypriot representative.

9. The said representative's rhetoric about "invasion" by Turkey cannot be taken seriously.

10. Yes, there was an invasion of Cyprus in 1974. But the Security Council records clearly show that the culprit was Greece and not Turkey. The late Archbishop Makarios is on the records of the Security Council stating in an explicit and lucid manner that the invader was Greece. For the benefit of the Greek Cypriot representative, I will quote the Archbishop verbatim. This is what the Archbishop said in his address to the Security Council on 19 July 1974. (S/PV.1780, para. 32):

> "The coup of the Greek junta is an invasion, and from its consequences the whole people of Cyprus suffers, both Greek and Turks ... The Security Council should call upon the military régime of Greece to withdraw from Cyprus the Greek officers serving in the National Guard, and to put an end to its invasion of Cyprus".

11. Turkish intervention was the only factor which could put an "end to (Greece's) invasion of Cyprus", and Turkey intervened and pushed back the invading Greek forces to the present lines and with it, put an end to the "suffering of the whole people of Cyprus, both Greeks and Turks".

12. As for the desperate and wretched reference to the "occupation", we can state, in no uncertain terms, that the Turkish Peace Forces, having secured the right to life and well-being of the Turksih Cypriots, are in Cyprus as the vanguard and guarantor of our right to life and security until a negotiated settlement is found in Cyprus.

13. The reference to the "forcible displacement" is totally a figment of imagination. Greek Cypriots had understandably followed the retreating invasion forces of Greece being pushed back by the Turkish Peace Forces, as the Turkish Cypriots understandably fled Southern Cyprus for the security of Northern Cyprus. This process was completed by the Voluntary Population Exchange Agreement signed by the leaders of the two communities at Vienna on 2 August 1975. This agreement was implemented with the help of the United Nations Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), and in UNFICYP vehicles.

14. Exaggeration of the number of Greek Cypriot displaced persons and omission of the fact that the Turkish people of Cyprus, between the years 1963 and 1974, have suffered forceful displacement at the hands of the Greek Cypriot leadership, not once but several times, do not give credence to the claims of the Greek Cypriot representative.

15. Turkish people of Cyprus had experienced forced displacement long before the events of 1974. Twenty-five thousand of them had been displaced since the Greek Cypriot onslaught of December 1963 during which 103 Turkish villages were completely or partially destroyed. Sixty-five thousand left their homes after 1974 for the safe areas of the north. The real number of the Greek Cypriot displaced persons cannot be much more than this total number of the Turkish Cypriot displaced persons.

16. The Greek Cypriot clamour for the return of all the "refugees" to their homes conflict not only with the Voluntary Population Exchange Agreement of 2 August 1975 but also with the principles embodied in the Denktas-Makarios Agreement of 12 December 1977, especially those of bi-zonality and bi-communality.

17. This clamour goes a long way in showing how insincere the Greek Cypriot leadership are in the search for a negotiated solution in Cyprus on the basis of a bi-zonal, bi-communal federal Republic.

(Signed) Kenan Atakol

UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social
Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/1990/88
2 March 1990

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Forty-sixth session
Agenda item 25

ELECTIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

Note by the Secretariat

1. The attention of the Commission is drawn to Economic and Social Council resolution 1983/32 of 27 May 1983 by which the Council decided that:

> "Notwithstanding paragraph 2 of article 13 of the rules of procedure of the functional commissions of the Economic and Social Council, the following rules shall henceforth apply to the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities:
>
> (a) A nomination of a candidate for membership of the Sub-Commission may be accompanied by a nomination of an expert of the same nationality, who shall be elected simultaneously with the candidate for membership, and who may serve temporarily as an alternate if the member is unable to attend;
>
> (b) The qualifications for alternates shall be the same as for members;
>
> (c) No person may serve as alternate for a member except the expert elected as alternate, pursuant to sub-paragraph (a) above."

2. It will be recalled that at its forty-fourth session (1988) the Commission on Human Rights elected Mr. Ahmed Khalifa for a four-year term; at that time no alternate was presented with Mr. Khalifa.

3. By a note verbale dated 28 February 1990, the Government of Egypt nominated Mr. Ahmed Tawfik Khalil as alternate to Mr. Ahmed Khalifa.

4. In accordance with the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1983/32, the Commission is called upon to elect Mr. Ahmed Khalifa and his alternate Mr. Ahmed Tawfik Khalil for the balance of the term of office of Mr.Khalifa which ends in 1992.

UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social
Council

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/1990/88/Add.1
5 March 1990

Original: ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Forty-sixth session
Agenda item 25

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

Note by the secretariat

The attention of the Commission is drawn to the curriculum vitae of Mr. Ahmed Tawfik Khalil.

CURRICULUM VITAE

MR. AHMED TAWFIK KHALIL

Mr. Ahmed Tawfik KHALIL was born in 1925, and joined the Egyptian Ministry for Foreign Affairs in 1948.

His previous diplomatic assignments include the Egyptian Embassies in London, Rome, New York and Chargé d'Affaires in Washington D.C.

He assumed the post of Ambassador in Helsinki from 1975 to 1978. From 1978 to 1980 he was Under-Secretary at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Cairo, Egypt, and following that was appointed as Ambassador of Egypt in Brussels from 1980 to 1983. From 1983 to 1985 he assumed the position of Egypt's Permanent Representative to the United Nations in New York.

During these assignments Mr. Khalil presided over the work of the Security Council and was former Chairman of the Group of 77 in New York.